

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed December 11, 2007, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration. Claims 1-21 are pending for examination with claims 1, 7, 14 and 18 being independent claims. No new matter has been added.

The Amendment Should be Entered

The amendment to dependent claim 13 should be entered because it clarifies limitations previously in the claims and should not be regarded as raising new issues. The amendment does, however, place the application in better condition for appeal.

Summary of Examiner Interview

Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesy of an interview on January 23, 2008. During the interview, limitations of each of the independent claims were discussed in relation to the references cited in the Office Action of December 11, 2007.

During the interview, the Examiner acknowledged that Rune does not teach a list of visible remote devices as recited in the claim, and that the third paragraph on page 3 of the Office Action of December 11, 2007, which suggests otherwise, is an error. However, the Examiner asserted that the Virtanen reference describes such a limitation.

The Amendments and remarks herein may serve as a further summary of the interview.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1, 2, 4-11, 13-18 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) based on Rune, U.S. Published Patent Application No. 2003/0060222 in view of Melpignano, U.S. Patent No. 7,193,989 and Virtanen, U.S. Published Patent Application No. 2003/0124978. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Independent claim 1 recites: "a list of visible remote devices comprising entries in the inquiry scan cache, concatenated with each entry in the page scan cache that the local device successfully contacts by way of a page scan." As clarified during the Interview, Rune does not describe concatenation of cache information to prepare a list as claimed. To the contrary, Rune

describes that these functions are independent. For example, paragraph 33 expressly states: “the functionality of the inquiry scan transceiver is independent of the traffic and page scan transceivers.” Thus, it is clear that the reference does not describe the use of an inquiry scan cache and a page scan cache together to form a list of visible remote devices.

Melpignano does not provide any reason to modify the system describe in Rune to include a list as claimed. This secondary reference is merely cited to demonstrate that refreshing a page scan cache is known and does not relate to formation of a list of visible device, as claimed.

Virtanen also does not describe “a list of visible remote devices comprising entries in the inquiry scan cache, concatenated with each entry in the page scan cache that the local device successfully contacts by way of a page scan,” as recited in claim 1. Virtanen describes only presenting the user with a list of visible remote devices using entries from an inquiry scan. There is no mention in Virtanen of concatenating to that list each entry in a page scan cache.

The passages of Virtanen cited in the Office Action appear to relate simply to using friendly names for devices located in the inquiry scan. As understood, Virtanen describes looking up a device’s identifying address to see if it is linked to name data in Virtanen’s telephone directory. If the device finds a corresponding address in the telephone directory, it substitutes the device’s Bluetooth name with the “friendly” name data from the telephone directory.

A telephone directory cannot be reasonable interpreted as “a page scan cache that is refreshed by way of an attempt to connect to at least one remote device,” as recited in claim 1. There is no indication in the reference that the telephone directory is operated as a cache. In fact, there is no reason that one of skill in the would use a telephone directory as a cache and refresh its entries based on a page scan. Thus, even if the references were combined, the combination would not each all limitations of claim 1.

Additionally, it must be noted that the Examiner has not put forth a *prima facie* case of obviousness, because there is no reason, apart from the insufficient justification of being in the same field, to combine the telephone directory of Virtanen with the system presented in Rune.

The other independent claims should also be allowed. Independent claim 7 recites: “forming the list of visible remote devices by combining at least a portion of the page scan cache with the inquiry scan cache.” Independent claim 14 recites: “forming a list of visible remote

Bluetooth devices comprising a combination of entries from the inquiry scan cache and the page scan cache.” Independent claim 18 recites: “a list of visible remote Bluetooth devices comprising entries in the inquiry scan cache, concatenated with each entry in the page scan cache that the local Bluetooth device successfully contacts by way of a page scan.”

As understood, independent claims 7, 14 and 18 are rejected based on the same rationale as is used to reject claim 1. However, from the foregoing, the reasons that the references do not establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness against independent claims 7, 14 or 18 should be apparent, and these claims should also be allowed.

The dependent claims recite limitations that further distinguish the references, providing addition reasons that the dependent claims should be allowed. As one example, claim 13 has been amended to make clear how the list may be used according to an embodiment of the invention. No function meeting this limitation is discussed in Rune, further demonstrating that there is no reason that supports the assertion that the claims are obvious in light of the references. Other dependent claims also recite limitations that similarly emphasize differences. For example, claim 4 also recites a limitation on how the claimed list is created.

Other types of differences are emphasized in other dependent claims. For example, claim 15 recites further details of how the claimed list is formed. Because the references do not relate to forming such a list as recited in the independent claims, they cannot provide any relevant teaching of the limitations of this dependent claim.

For all of the foregoing reasons, the claims should be allowed.

CONCLUSION

A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at the telephone number listed below if this communication does not place the case in condition for allowance.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicant hereby requests any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, that is not covered by an enclosed check, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 23/2825.

Dated: March 11, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Edmund J. Walsh, Reg. No. 32,950
Wolf, Greenfield & Sacks, P.C.
Federal Reserve Plaza
600 Atlantic Avenue
Boston, Massachusetts 02210-2206
Telephone: (617) 646-8000